99

# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 10/083,489 | 02/27/2002 | Masaki Tonomura | 1095.1213 | 5927 |

21171 7590 09/08/2006

STAAS & HALSEY LLP
SUITE 700
1201 NEW YORK AVENUE, N.W.
WASHINGTON, DC 20005

| EXAMINER | |
|---|---|
| ROMANO, JOHN J | |

| ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
|---|---|
| 2192 | |

DATE MAILED: 09/08/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

| Office Action Summary | Application No. | Applicant(s) | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | 10/083,489 | TONOMURA, MASAKI | |
| | Examiner | Art Unit | |
| | John J. Romano | 2192 | |

*-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --*

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *8/07/2006*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-12 and 15-18* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-12 and 15-18* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

## DETAILED ACTION

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 11/14/2005 has been entered.

Applicant's amendment and response received August 7th, 2006, responding to the April 5th, 2006, Office action provided in the rejections of claims 1-12 and 15-16, wherein claims 1, 2, 9, 11, 15 and 16 have been amended, and claims 17 and 18 have been added. Claims 1-12 and 15-18, remain pending in the application and which have been fully considered by the examiner.

### *Prior Art's Arguments – Rejections*

2. Applicant's arguments filed August 7th, 2006, in particular on pages 1-3 of the remarks, have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. For example,
(A) In regard to the argument that *"formal requirement"* clarifies the independent claims to overcome the prior art of record, (pages 1-3 of "Remarks", of the amendment and response) and as the instant application has indicated in claims 1, 2, 9, 11 and 15, the examiner respectfully disagrees. The Applicant argues and indicates in the

independent claims that "formal requirements" are acquired and that they are defined in a structured document; however, "formal requirements" are not explicitly and deliberately defined. For the sake of compact prosecution the Examiner is interpreting "formal requirements" to mean required information. Accordingly, the arguments are moot in view of the new grounds of rejection.

(B) Applicant's remaining arguments have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

## Claim Rejections

Claims **1-12** and **15-18**, are pending in this action.

## *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103*

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims **1-4, 9-12** and **15-16** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Weinberg et al., US 6,587,969 B1 (hereinafter **Weinberg**) in view of Renner et al., US 6,993,657 (hereinafter **Renner**).

In regard to claims **1**, **9** and **11 Weinberg** discloses:

- "...*computer readable medium storing*...", (E.g., see Column 6, lines 1-15), wherein data is stored and read.
- "... *for assisting in testing operation of a server computer which provides services using a structured document which can be browsed by a document browsing device, the test assisting program enabling a computer to carry out a process comprising steps of*...", (E.g., see Figure 6C & Column 2, lines 23-35), wherein the testing tool comprises a test assisting program and the structured documents are the programs for the web pages displayed by the web browser.
- "...*acquiring formal requirements for data to be inputted to a data input area of the structured document upon reception of the structured document from the server computer* ...", (E.g., see Figure 7 & Column 22, lines 60-64), wherein the data to be entered would comprise an input step that requires data from a parameter.
- "... *generating candidate data for data to be inputted into the data input area based on the formal requirements therefor* ...", (E.g., see Figure 8 & Column 21, line 46 – Column 22, line 7), wherein the data references associated with the function call, associated with data tables in the

input/output data library, are generated and (Column 2, lines 53-56), wherein "An important benefit of this feature is that it allows the user to *generate* and edit tests...".

- "... *inserting the candidate data ...for enabling the document browsing device to carry out a process of displaying the candidate data and a process of entering the candidate data selected by an operation input into the data input area, in the structured document...*", (E.g., see Figure 3B & Column 19, lines 32-52), wherein the loop object provides instructions for input data to the browser to display a structured document or view of a webpage.
- "... *transferring the structured document with the candidate data inserted therein to the document browsing device.*", (E.g., see Figure 6C & Column 22, lines 22-36), wherein the testing tool is the processing description to test a structured document and is shown in Figure 6C being communicated to a server, thus transferred.

But **Weinberg** does not expressly disclose "... *the formal requirements being defined in the structured document by using a first tag and parameters thereof, the input area being defined in the structured document by using a second tag and parameters thereof, the first and second tags sharing a common parameter value...*" or "... *into the structured document by using a third tag...*". However, **Renner** discloses:

- "... *the formal requirements being defined in the structured document by using a first tag and parameters thereof...*", (E.g., see Figure 6C &

Column 21, lines 35-46), wherein the data (name) to be entered would comprise attribute value of the component used and that data provided (name) relates to the second tag describing the individual component . The first tag is the template used to hold the input name required (E.g., see Table 1B, line 9) and the second tag defines the input area (E.g., see Column 29, Table 2, lines 21-24

- "...*the input area being defined in the structured document by using a second tag and parameters thereof, the first and second tags sharing a common parameter value...*"; (E.g., see Figure 6C & Column 21, lines 35-46), wherein the data (name) to be entered would comprise attribute value of the component used and that data provided (name) relates to the second tag describing the individual component . The first tag is the template used to hold the input name required (E.g., see Column 27, Table 1B, line 9) and the second tag defines the input area (E.g., see Column 29, Table 2, lines 21-24.
- "...*the first and second tags sharing a common parameter value...*", (E.g., see Column 27, Table 1B, lines 1-13), wherein a default common value is given until a developer optionally adjusts the value at a later time.
- "... *into the structured document by using a third tag...*", (E.g., see Column 29, Table 2, line 5), wherein a third tag in the structured document involves a processing description.

**Weinberg** and **Renner** are analogous art because they are both concerned with the same field of endeavor, namely, managing a web server. Therefore, at the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine first, second and third tags in a structured document with **Weinbergs'** testing method and display. The motivation is disclosed by **Weinberg,** "The expert mode allows the user to...make modifications to the text. The user can thereby create functions and queries that may not be part of the automated features of the test to provide a higher level of test customization", (Column 20, lines 7-11). Additionally, the "custom" tags disclosed by **Renner** above (E.g., see Table 2) would have further motivated a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify by creating custom tags as shown.

In regard to claim **2**, the rejections of base claim **1** are incorporated. Furthermore, **Weinberg** discloses:

- "... *generating data matching the formal requirements and data not matching the formal requirements*.", (E.g., see Figure 4A & Column 15, lines 15-34), wherein the result is "TRUE" if the data matches or "NOT TRUE" if it does not.

In regard to claims **3, 10** and **12 Weinberg** discloses:

- "... *determining details of an operation input for requesting the server computer to carry out a process when the operation input is applied to the document browsing device*...", (E.g., see Table 2 & Column 9 – Column 10), wherein the "Submit Data" step comprises input data

submitted to the server and "Text check", "Image Check" and "Applet Check" perform processes with the applied input.

- "... *generating a log file in which the determined details of the operation input are recorded...*", (E.g., see Figure 7 & Column 23, lines 11-19), wherein a log file is generated from the test results.
- "... *reproducing the operation input applied to the document browsing device according to the details of the operation input which are recorded in the log file.*", (E.g., see Figure 10 & Column 24, lines 45-51), wherein the spreadsheet location may be the test results recorded in the log file.

In regard to claim **4**, the rejections of base claim **3** are incorporated. Furthermore, **Weinberg** discloses:

- "...*an object to be operated on is displayed in highlight for a predetermined period of time when the operation input is reproduced.*", (E.g., see Column 16, lines 44-46), wherein when the test is played back or reproduced and the corresponding objects or steps are highlighted. The predetermined time period is the duration of the execution of that particular step.

In regard to claims **9** and **10**, they are system versions of the process of claims **1** and **3** respectively. Therefore, the limitations of claims **9** and **10** are met accordingly.

In regard to claims **11** and **12**, they are apparatus versions of the process of claims **1** and **3** respectively. Therefore, the limitations of claims **11** and **12** are met accordingly.

In regard to claim **15**, Weinberg discloses:

- "*A method for testing operation of a server computer from a browsing computer, comprising: acquiring formal requirements for data to be inputted to a data input area upon reception of a document from the server computer ...*", (E.g., see Figure 6C & Column 21, lines 35-46), wherein the data to be entered would comprise attribute type or information for the input to the structured document from the server.
- "*... generating candidate data for data to be inputted into the data input area based on the formal requirements*.", (E.g., see Figure 8 & Column 21, line 46 – Column 22, line 7), wherein the data references associated with the function call, associated with data tables in the input/output data library, are generated and (Column 2, lines 53-56), wherein "An important benefit of this feature is that it allows the user to *generate* and edit tests...".

In regard to claim **16**, Weinberg does not expressly disclose "*...wherein the inserting operation inserts the third tag and parameters thereof after the second tag defining the data input area, such that the candidate data will be associated with the data input area.*" However, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to insert the *third tag and parameters thereof* after

the second tag defining the data input are, such that the candidate data will be associated with the data input area. It is old and well known in the art to further define information in a structured document with subsequent tags. Further motivation would have been that it is old and well known in the art that structured documents are a hierarchical data structure that has a sequence of tags defining data.

4. Claims **5** and **6** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Weinberg** in view of **Renner**.

In regard to claim **5**, the rejections of base claim **4** are incorporated. But **Weinberg** does not expressly disclose "...the operation input is prevented from being reproduced until the display in highlight of the object to be operated on is finished.". However, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to prevent the next operation or input operation from being performed until the previous step or decision was completed or confirmed. The motivation to do so would have been to complete an iteration of the test before entering another input to begin another iteration. This would be consistent with certain testing phases of a web browser as it is often beneficial to test one thing at a time. Therefore, at the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to prevent an input operation form being reproduced until the highlighted display of a step or object is finished.

In regard to claim **6**, the rejections of base claim **3** are incorporated. Furthermore, **Weinberg** discloses:

- "*...wherein when a process result is returned from the server computer due to the reproduced operation input, the test assisting program enables the computer to compare the process result and a past process result returned from the server computer due to the operation input...*", (E.g., see Figures 5C-E & Column 19, lines 12-31), wherein the output of the test and verify expression or comparison definition are returned due to the input.

But **Weinberg** does not expressly disclose "*...and display a difference between the compared process results.*". However, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to customize the comparison by displaying the difference if appropriate. The motivation is disclosed by **Weinberg,** "The expert mode allows the user to...make modifications to the text. The user can thereby create functions and queries that may not be part of the automated features of the test to provide a higher level of test customization.", (Column 20, lines 7-11). Thus, if a display of the difference would be beneficial the suggestion to customize the function was evident. Therefore, at the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to customize the display to incorporate the difference of the compared results.

5. Claim **7** is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Weinberg** in view of **Renner** and further in view of Dantressangle, US 6,446,120 B1 (hereinafter **Dantressangle**).

In regard to claim **7**, the rejections of base claim **3** are incorporated. But **Weinberg** does not expressly disclose "*...to measure a time from a decision in the operation input for requesting the server computer to carry out the process until a process result is returned from the server computer, and display the measured time.*". However, **Dantressangle** discloses:

- "*...to measure a time from a decision in the operation input for requesting the server computer to carry out the process until a process result is returned from the server computer, and display the measured time.*", (E.g., see Figure 7 & Column 8, lines 41-60), wherein a timer function is used to provide a report or display the measured time.

**Weinberg** and **Dantressangle** are analogous art because they are both concerned with the same field of endeavor, namely, testing a web server. Therefore, at the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine a measured time with **Weinbergs'** testing method and display. The motivation is disclosed by **Weinberg,** "The expert mode allows the user to...make modifications to the text. The user can thereby create functions and queries that may not be part of the automated features of the test to provide a higher level of test customization.", (Column 20, lines 7-11).

6. Claim **8** is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Weinberg** in view of **Renner** and further in view of Gough et al., US 6,072,489, (hereinafter **Gough**).

In regard to claim **8**, the rejections of base claim **3** are incorporated. But **Weinberg** does not expressly disclose "...*to render translucent an operation view for entering the operation input and display the translucent operation view.*". However, **Kake** discloses:

- "...*to render translucent an operation view for entering the operation input and display the translucent operation view.*", (E.g., see Figure 3b & Column 3, line 66- Column 4, line 5), wherein two objects are overlapped making them translucent for entering data input.

**Weinberg** and **Gough** are analogous art because they are both concerned with the same field of endeavor, namely, a program, which gathers information and displays them in a window viewing environment. Therefore, at the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine a translucent display with **Weinbergs** testing method and display. The motivation is disclosed by **Weinberg,** "The expert mode allows the user to...make modifications to the text. The user can thereby create functions and queries that may not be part of the automated features of the test to provide a higher level of test customization.", (Column 20, lines 7-11).

7. Claims **17** and **18** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Weinberg** in view of **Renner** and further in view of Murren et al., US 2004/0205525 (hereinafter **Murren**).

In regard to claim **17**, the rejections of base claim **1** are incorporated. But **Weinberg** and **Renner** do not expressly disclose "...*the formal requirements specify a*

*maximum length of the piece of text; and the candidate data for the text violates the specified maximum length*". However, **Murren** discloses:

- "*...the formal requirements specify a maximum length of the piece of text.*", (E.g., see paragraph [0153]), wherein a maximum length of data input is disclosed. But, Murren does not expressly disclose "*the candidate data for the text violates the specified maximum length*".

**Weinberg, Renner** and **Murren** are analogous art because they are both concerned with the same field of endeavor, namely, a program, which gathers information and displays them in a window viewing environment. Therefore, at the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine a translucent display with **Weinbergs** testing method and display. The motivation is disclosed by **Weinberg,** "The expert mode allows the user to...make modifications to the text. The user can thereby create functions and queries that may not be part of the automated features of the test to provide a higher level of test customization.", (Column 20, lines 7-11).

But, **Murren** does not expressly disclose "*the candidate data for the text violates the specified maximum length*". However, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to test a program by violating the program. The motivation to do so is that it is old and well known in the computer programming art, to debug programs by inputting error conditions and validating that the error is handled appropriately.

In regard to claim **18**, the rejections of base claim **17** are incorporated. But **Weinberg** and **Renner** do not expressly disclose "*...the formal requirements specify a maximum length of the piece of text; and the candidate data for the text violates the specified maximum length*". However, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to test the boundaries of the range of inputs. The motivation to do so is that it is old and well known in the computer program testing art to test the boundaries of data input by exceeding the boundaries. Furthermore, it is old and well known in the art, to comment about the computer code and indicating so by comments via wording with special symbols ("//"). Therefore, the wording of text longer than the maximum would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the computer testing art.

8. Claims **1-3, 7, 9-12** and **15-16** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable Muraishi et al., US 2001/0028359 A1 (hereinafter **Muraishi**) in view of **Renner**.

In regard to claims **1**, **9** and **11, Muraishi** discloses:

- "*...computer readable medium storing...*", (E.g., see Figure 12), wherein a computer readable medium is stored.
- "*... for assisting in testing operation of a server computer which provides services using a structured document which can be browsed by a document browsing device, the test assisting program enabling a computer to carry out a process comprising steps of...*", (E.g., see Figure 1 & Page 3, Paragraph [0053]), wherein the structured

document is the screen program and the document browsing device is the GUI.

- "... *acquiring formal requirements for data to be inputted to a data input area of the structured document upon reception of the structured document from the server computer* ...", (E.g., see Figure 4 & Page 3, Paragraph [0060] and [0086]), wherein a server environment is disclosed comprising required information.
- "... *generating candidate data for data to be inputted into the data input area based on the formal requirements therefor* ...", (E.g., see Figure 4 & Page 3, Paragraph [0062]), wherein the input data file is the candidate data and is based on the screen definition information or attribute information.
- "... *inserting a the candidate data for enabling the document browsing device to carry out a process of displaying the candidate data and a process of entering the candidate data selected by an operation input into the data input area, in the structured document...*", (E.g., see Figure 3 & Page 3, Paragraph [0064] and [0066]).
- "... *transferring the structured document with the candidate data inserted therein to the document browsing device*.", (E.g., see Page 5, Paragraph [0086]), wherein it is inherent that in a server environment data is transferred.

But **Murashi** does not expressly disclose "... *the formal requirements being defined in the structured document by using a first tag and parameters thereof, the input area being defined in the structured document by using a second tag and parameters thereof, the first and second tags sharing a common parameter value...*" or "... *into the structured document by using a third tag...*". However, **Renner** discloses:

- "... *the formal requirements being defined in the structured document by using a first tag and parameters thereof...*", (E.g., see Figure 6C & Column 21, lines 35-46), wherein the data (name) to be entered would comprise attribute value of the component used and that data provided (name) relates to the second tag describing the individual component . The first tag is the template used to hold the input name required (E.g., see Table 1B, line 9) and the second tag defines the input area (E.g., see Column 29, Table 2, lines 21-24
- "...*the input area being defined in the structured document by using a second tag and parameters thereof, the first and second tags sharing a common parameter value...*", (E.g., see Figure 6C & Column 21, lines 35-46), wherein the data (name) to be entered would comprise attribute value of the component used and that data provided (name) relates to the second tag describing the individual component . The first tag is the template used to hold the input name required (E.g., see Column 27, Table 1B, line 9) and the second tag defines the input area (E.g., see Column 29, Table 2, lines 21-24.

- "...*the first and second tags sharing a common parameter value...*", (E.g., see Column 27, Table 1B, lines 1-13), wherein a default common value is given until a developer optionally adjusts the value at a later time.
- "... *into the structured document by using a third tag...*", (E.g., see Column 29, Table 2, line 5), wherein a third tag in the structured document involves a processing description.

**Murashi** and **Renner** are analogous art because they are both concerned with the same field of endeavor, namely, managing a web server. Therefore, at the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine first, second and third tags in a structured document with **Weinbergs'** testing method and display. The motivation is disclosed by **Renner** as the "custom" tags disclosed by Renner above (E.g., see Table 2) would have motivated a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify by creating custom tags as shown.

In regard to claim **2**, the rejections of base claim **1** are incorporated. Furthermore, **Muraishi** discloses:

- "...*generating data matching the formal requirements and data not matching the formal requirements*.", (E.g., see Figure 9 & Page 4, Paragraph [0078]), wherein both cases are disclosed.

In regard to claim **15**, **Muraishi** discloses:

- "*A method for testing operation of a server computer from a browsing computer, comprising: acquiring information of a data input area upon*

*reception of a document from the server computer ...*", (E.g., see Figure 4 & Page 3, Paragraph [0060] and [0086]), wherein a server environment is disclosed.

"... *generating candidate data for data to be inputted into the data input area based on the acquired information.*", (E.g., see Figure 4 & Page 3, Paragraph [0062]), wherein the input data file is the candidate data and is based on the screen definition information or attribute information.

In regard to claims **3, 10** and **12 Muraishi** discloses:

- "... *determining details of an operation input for requesting the server computer to carry out a process when the operation input is applied to the document browsing device...*", (E.g., see Figure 10 & Page 4, Paragraph [0080]), wherein input information or details are embedded in a input area of a screen program or browsing device.
- "... *the determined details of the operation input are recorded...*", (E.g., see Figure 5 & Page 3, Paragraph [0066]), wherein the test results are recorded.
- "... *reproducing the operation input applied to the document browsing device according to the details of the operation input which are recorded.*", (E.g., see Figure 5 & Page 3, Paragraph [0066]), wherein the execution result of the previous test results are used and recorded.

But **Muraishi** does not expressly disclose a "...log file.". However, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to

save the execution data in a log file. The motivation to do so would have been to use the results for another test as disclosed by **Muraishi** (Page 3, Paragraph [0066]). Therefore, at the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to save the data in a log file.

In regard to claim **7**, the rejections of base claim **3** are incorporated. Furthermore, **Muraishi** discloses:

- "...to measure a time from a decision in the operation input for requesting the server computer to carry out the process until a process result is returned from the server computer, and display the measured time....", (E.g., see Figures 30 & Page 7, Paragraph [0120])), wherein the output of the time measurement is disclosed.

In regard to claim **16**, **Muraishi** does not expressly disclose "*...wherein the inserting operation inserts third tag and parameters thereof after the second tag defining the data input area, such that the candidate data will be associated with the data input area.*" However, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to insert the *third tag and parameters thereof* after the second tag defining the data input are, such that the candidate data will be associated with the data input area. It is old and well known in the art to further define information in a structured document with subsequent tags. Further motivation would have been that it is old and well known in the art that structured documents are a hierarchical data structure that has a sequence of tags defining data.

***Conclusion***

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to John J. Romano whose telephone number is (571) 272-3872. The examiner can normally be reached on 8-5:30, M-F.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Tuan Q. Dam can be reached on (571) 272-3695. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

JJR

TUAN DAM
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER